DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 826 EC 090 017

AUTHOR	Moore, Mary W.; Peabody, Ralph L.
TITLE	A Functional Description of the Itinerant Teacher of Visually Handicapped Children in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. School of Education.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	87p.; Best Available Copy
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Itinerant Teachers; *State Surveys; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Role; *Visually Handicapped

ABSTRACT

Examined were the functions and characteristics of 80 itinerant teachers of the visually handicapped in Pennsylvania. Teachers responded to a questionnaire which covered demographic data, functions and activities, and teacher competencies. Results indicated that the average itinerant teacher each week spent 19 1/4 hours in direct instruction, 1 1/2 hours consulting with regular teachers, 2 1/4 hours in material procurement or development, 2 hours in consultation with parents and others, 2 1/2 hours in administrative duties, and 5 1/4 hours in driving. The average teacher had a caseload of 19 children and received referrals from school nurses, classroom teachers, and principals. Competencies identified included skill in teaching remedial reading and listening skills and the assessment of visual functioning. The questionnaire is appended. (DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123826

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ITINERANT TEACHER OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mary W. Moore, Ph.D.
Ralph L. Peabody, Ed.D.
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty Research Grant
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

EC 090017

PREFACE

The project directors wish to thank Dr. John O. Bolvin, Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, and the members of the Faculty Research Fund Sub-committee of the School of Education for awarding the grant which supported this research.

Thanks also are due to Ms. Flora Williams for her invaluable assistance in coding and analyzing the data.

The largest contribution, however, has been that of the itinerant teachers in Pennsylvania who so willingly participated by supplying data. The project directors hope that this report will be of value to them and will, in part, repay them for their cooperation.

M.M.M.

R.L.P.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
i	Preface	
ii	Contents	
iii	Tables	
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PROCEDURES	5
III.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS:	
	Itinerant Teachers	10
	Teacher Consultants	30
	Rural vs. Suburban-Urban Itinerant Teachers	40
IV.	DISCUSSION	48
V.	A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPICAL ITINERANT TEACHER OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PENNSYLVANIA.	56
APPENDIX	REFERENCES	
	INSTRUMENT	

TABLES

		PAGE
I.	Total Number of Children on Caseload. (Itinerant Teachers)	10
II.	Teachers Reporting Children on Caseload. (Itinerant Teachers)	11
III.	Children Who Required Regular Service. (Itinerant Teachers)	12
IV.	Children in Total Case Load in Other Special Programs.	13
V.	Referral Sources. (Itinerant Teachers)	15
VI.	Ancillary Services (Itinerant Teachers)	16
VII.	Procurement of Materials (Itinerant Teachers)	17
VIII.	Percentages of Time Involved with Activities (Itinerant Teachers)	18
IX.	Additional Functions (Itinerant Teachers)	35
X.	Comparison Rural vs. Suburban - Urban Total Number of Children on Case Load.	41
XI.	Comparison Rural vs. Suburban - Urban Teachers Reporting Children on Case Load.	42
XII.	Comparison Rural vs. Suburban - Urban Teachers Children Who Required Regular Service	43
XIII.	Comparison Rural vs. Suburban-Urban Teachers Percentages of Time Involved with Activities	45

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ITINERANT TEACHER OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

I. Introduction

This investigation was designed to systematically collect and analyze data to the end that a functional description of the itinerant teacher of visually handicapped children in Pennsylvania might be formulated. In the itinerant teaching program, the visually handicapped child is enrolled in his neighborhood school and services are brought to him by one who has had professional preparation in the education of visually handicapped children. The program has grown rapidly during the last twenty-five years over the entire nation. In many cases, the development has been the result of a long, careful planning process by educators of blind children. Other programs have evolved because of the expressed desires of individual parents to keep their children at home. Presently, the pattern is such that in each area the program operates in a unique fashion depending upon geography, population, administrative policy, and the teacher's own perception of his role.

There have been no broad scale investigations calculated to show just what itinerant teachers of visually handicapped children do in carrying out their day-to-day professional responsibilities. Teacher educators and other professionals have expressed opinions

based on theoretical orientation and upon personal experiences. An investigation of the situational realities faced by the teachers in the field may test the validity of these opinions. This information should be basic to realistic planning for the development of professional preparation of itinerant teachers of visually handicapped children as well as for the development of new programs for visually handicapped children both school age and preschool. the evaluation of existing itinerant programs, the development programs for the children with other than visual handicaps the production of educational media and materials and research concerning educational characteristics of visually handicapped children.

Some authorities have differed in definition of the role of the itinerant teacher. Jones (1968) implied a teaching role:

> Under this plan children usually are enrolled in regular schools near their homes and provided with special instruction in keeping with their needs by itinerant teachers. These teachers travel among the schools in one or more districts or counties... regular classroom teachers assume much of the responsibility for educating visually handicapped children. Individual supplemental instruction and the teaching of specific skills made necessary by the child's handicapping condition are provided by specially qualified itinerant teachers.

Bertram (1963) implied a counseling and procurement role:

> ... the itinerant teacher plan, in which the student is registered in the regular grade, does all his work there, using special materials which he receives from a traveling special teacher, who trains him in their use and counsels with him on how to handle his problem.

The Teacher Education Advisory Committee of the American Foundation of the Blind (1961) supported Jones (1969) as he described, also, a consultant or teacher-consultant role:

> The comparatively low prevalence of visually handicapped children and the limited amount of special services or special instruction required by some of these children have led to the employment of teacher-consultants in some areas. . . Teacher-consultants serve both as itinerant teachers and as consultants to regular teachers-and administrators.

Specific functions of itinerant teachers have been outlined in the literature. The American Foundation for the Blind published four monographs: Resources for Teachers of Blind with Sighted Children (]957) Itinerant Teaching Services for Blind Children (1957), The Pine Brook Report (]954). and Concerning the Education of Blind Children (]959). These monographs presented the philosophy concerning itinerant teaching service and the definition and role of the itinerant teacher as they were accepted by most of the authorities at that time. Jones (]969) in The Visually Handicapped Child at Home and School, presented the needs of visually handicapped children and functions of the itinerant teacher which would meet those needs.

However, a pilot study conducted by the authors in 1970, using the Critical Incident Technique (Flanagan,]954) revealed that the duties the teachers were actually performing which they considered outstandingly effective or ineffective, were involved with only a small number of functions recommended in the literature.

Recently, some authorities have been advocating administrative plans other than special class placement for educational services to children with learning handicaps, such as borderline retardation, hearing handicaps, emotional disorders and specific learning disabilities (Dunn,]969).Various supplementary services including itinerant services for children enrolled in regular programs have

been suggested. The itinerant teaching programs for visually handicapped children should contribute to the planning of other models. Specific information about the services which have been found to be effective in the visually handicapped program would be necessary.

One of the first steps in research concerned with the evaluation of itinerant teaching is to collect data regarding the actual duties of the itinerant teachers who have been functioning in the field during recent years.

II. Procedures

In fall, 1974, a preliminary instrument was developed and field tested in a pilot study of 14 itinerant teachers in Allegheny Intermediate Unit #3. The first part of the instrument was designed to collect such demographic data as size of caseload, geographic area of service, ancillary services available to teachers, and general responsibilities for procurement of material. The last part of the instrument was designed to identify those specific functions actually performed by the teachers, and the importance placed upon each one. The assumption was made that if the function was required for administrative purposes, or if the teacher believed it to be educationally effective, the teacher would perform the function for more of the children; therefore, the number of children, as reflected by a percent of case load, for whom a function was performed reflected the emphasis placed upon it.

The functions which were listed, for which the teachers were to indicate the number of children for which they were performed, were derived from three sources. Reports of "critical" behaviors which had been reported by itinerant teachers in a previous study were analyzed and classified into functional categories and behaviors. A review of the literature was conducted, and suggested responsibilities were translated into behaviorally described functions. The American Foundation for the Blind recently embarked upon a national project,

involving teacher educators, to define the competencies of teachers of visually handicapped children and youth which should be developed through college and university training. The list of competencies which have been developed served as an additional basis for the selection of items for the instrument.

The pilot study was conducted to: (1) identify changes which should be made in directions or in items on the instrument and (2) to establish the average time which would be required of the teachers to complete the report. After the preliminary questionnaire had been completed by the itinerant teachers in Allegheny Intermediate Unit, the principle investigator met with the teachers to collect impressions and objective feedback. The final instrument was developed to include the revisions and additions which were suggested by these teacher-participants. Changes from the preliminary instrument included the addition of severely multihandicapped children to the categories which were to be reported by the itinerant teachers to be surveyed, the rewording of some directions, and the inclusion of additional functions in the areas of guidance and counseling.

Permission to conduct the study was solicited from Directors of Special Education for each of 29 Intermediate Units in the Commonwealth. After a follow-up solicitation, permission was obtained from all but one Intermediate Unit. Each was supplied with an abstract of the study, assurance that costs would be absorbed by the project, anonymity of participants would be preserved, data would be used for research purposes only, and results of study would

be reported to administrators and teacher-participants in the study.

No sampling procedures were employed since no general pattern of administration had been established with which to compare a sample representation. Efforts were made to collect responses from the entire population.

The Pennsylvania Materials Center for the Visually Handicapped publishes, each year, a directory of teachers who are employed in itinerant programs in Pennsylvania. The 14 teachers in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit and 2 in the Intermediate Unit from whom permission was not received were not included in the survey. The 93 remaining teachers identified by the PMCVH were asked to complete the questionnaire. Teachers who judged their positions not to be within either the stated definition of Itinerant Teacher or Teacher-Consultant were requested to describe their positions and to return the blank questionnaire to the investigator. The four who returned the blank questionnaire described their positions as:

> 'I am a teacher with a full time aide, in a self contained classroom."
>
> 'As coordinator of vision services, I maintain only two students on my caseload.'
>
> January 27, 1975, a classroom was started for the blind and visually limited. We are trying mainstreaming and have been partially successful in our short time.'
>
> The fourth teacher described her program briefly and returned the blank questionnaire.

A total of 66 valid questionnaires were completed. Since responses totaled over 75% of the requested participation, and since, in the preservation of anonymity of response, those who did not respond could

not be identified, no follow-up solicitation was conducted, and no attempt was made to investigate the characteristics of non-responders.

Of the 66 teachers who responded, 56 considered themselves to be itinerant teachers and 10, teacher consultants. Further analysis revealed that 8 of the 10 teacher-consultants were serving in an inner-city urban setting, and one was serving as head teacher in an urban area. Further analysis revealed such wide differences on demographic variables between the itinerant teacher population and the teacher-consultant population (e.g. case load differences between 20 children and 116 children) that the decision was made to describe the functions of the two populations separately. Some brief description of administrative situations in the two largest cities with "inner-city urban" populations may clarify this decision. In Philadelphia, Logan School serves as the central school for children who are visually handicapped at the elementary level. Children who cannot succeed are assigned to Logan School and are withdrawn from, or not enrolled in the itinerant program. In Pittsburgh, four resource-special classes exist in addition to the residential school. Most of the severely visually handicapped and/or multiply handicapped children are assigned to these classes or to the residential school. Teachers who indicated that they served the role of itinerant teacher and who indicated their geographic area as "inner-city urban" were considered with the total population of itinerant teachers.

The majority of itinerant teachers(82%) served as academic teachers 100% of their time; five percent served as orientation and mobility instructors 100% of their time. The remaining (12.5%) itinerant teachers who served as part time academic and orientation and mobility teachers, reported that they served in academic instruction from 80 to 95% of the time. Teachers were asked if they provided specific services to any children who were normally assigned to another teacher, and to describe the services provided. Twelve teachers (10 itinerant teachers and 2 teacher-consultants) reported and all indicated they were instructing children in reading with the Optacon.

All of the reporting teachers (itinerants and teacher-consultants) were employed in public day school programs. Geographic areas included rural (32%) suburban-urban (50%) and inner city urban (18%).

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

ITINERANT TEACHERS

Caseload

Teachers who were employed as itinerant teachers of academic subjects (100%) or Orientation and Mobility (100%) reported the numbers of children whom they served. Tables I, III and IV list those reported.

TABLE I

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN ON CASELOAD

Program - Learners	Range... Acad.	O&M	Average
Pre-school visual	0-5	0-1	0.453
Pre-school non-visual	0-2	0	0.245
Elementary visual	0-33	2-3	10.472
Elementary non-visual	0-3	1-2	0.226
Secondary visual	0-19	3-4	6.358
Secondary non-visual	0-3	2-3	0.340
Severely multihandicapped, visual	0-9	0-1	0.623
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	0-2	0	0.170
TOTAL			18.887

Most of the teachers reported that they had elementary visual learners and/or secondary visual learners on their caseloads. However, many reported no children in other categories. Table II lists the categories, numbers and percentages of teachers who reported children in each.

TABLE II

TEACHERS REPORTING CHILDREN ON CASELOAD

Program - Learners	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
Pre-school visual	16	34
Pre-school non-visual	8	20
Elementary visual	46	82
Elementary non-visual	9	21
Secondary visual	44	79
Secondary non-visual	7	13
Severely multihandicapped visual	15	32
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	7	13

TABLE III

CHILDREN WHO REQUIRED REGULAR SERVICE

Program - Learners	...Range... Acad.	O&M	Average
Pre-school visual	0-5	0-1	0.264
Pre-school non-visual	0-2	0	0.094
Elementary visual	0-22	1-3	7.717
Elementary non-visual	0-3	1-2	0.226
Secondary visual	0-12	1-4	3.693
Secondary non-visual	0-2	2-5	0.264
Severely multihandicapped visual	0-6	0-1	0.396
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	0-2	0	0.151
TOTAL			12.810

TABLE IV

CHILDREN IN TOTAL CASE LOAD IN OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Program - Learner	....Range.... Acad.	O&M	Average
Preschool visual	0-5	0	0.208
Preschool non-visual	0-2	0	0.113
Elementary visual	0-9	0-1	2.113
Elementary non-visual	0-1	0	0.094
Secondary visual	0-6	1-2	1.057
Elementary non-visual	0-1	0-1	0.094
TOTAL			3.679

The average case load of those who reported that they were employed as both academic teachers and teachers of orientation and mobility, was 21 children. For an average of five of these children they were responsible for instruction in orientation and mobility only four on a regular basis, one of whom was severely multihandicapped in a special program. For the remaining 16 children, they were responsible for both orientation and mobility and academics, or for academics only, 10 on a regular basis.

The average caseload of the three itinerant teachers who were employed to teach orientation and mobility only was six children,

five of whom required regular instruction, one being severely multihandicapped in a special program.

Severely Multihandicapped Children

Itinerant teachers reported 42 severely multihandicapped children for whom they had responsibilities distributed in age four children aged below six years; 19 children between the ages of six and 12 years; 21 children between the ages of 13 and 18; and three children over 18 years. Three of these children were placed in State School and Hospitals, two were homebound, and 27 were in special classrooms.

Other Responsibilities for Children

Teachers reported children other than visually handicapped for whom they had responsibilities as follows:

> Learning and adjustment - on caseload primarily due to doctor's recommendations - teach reading and do counseling.
>
> One child has 20/20 vision, but brain damage. He is in an EMR class. I teach him academic subjects.
>
> All of my students have some degree of visual impairment, but in many cases, the chief hindrance is learning disability, emotional problems, mental retardation, frequent absences, physical impairment, etc.
>
> Often a child with probable visual perceptual or minimal L.D. characteristics will be referred to me. I will work with and evaluate on a temporary basis until I can determine the extent of visual involvement. If it is minimal, referral is then made to L.D. personnel for follow-up. I list these children on my roll as 'protective' for want of a better label. The numbers vary, but must never exceed total of blind and partially sighted on my roll.

"At present I'm serving seven children who have Learning Disabilities or perceptual problems - however you want to label them. These are included with my total case load."

Referrals

Most of the teachers (95%) reported that referrals were made by school nurses. Table V lists the referral sources reported by itinerant teachers, tabulated by percentages of teachers reporting each category.

TABLE V

REFERRAL SOURCES

Source	Percent of Teachers
School nurses	95
Classroom teachers	64
Principals or other Administrators	55
Eye Specialists	50
Parents	32
Social Workers	29
Other	27

Other sources of referrals included Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, school psychologists and guidance counselors.

Ancillary Services

Most of the teachers (92%) reported that psychological testing was available. Table VI lists other ancillary services which were available to children and parents, tabulated by percentages of teachers reporting each category.

TABLE VI

ANCILLARY SERVICES

Service	Percent of Teachers
Psychological Testing	92
Remedial Reading Services	82
Vocational Counseling	61
Social Work Counseling	50
Psychological Counseling	43
Low Vision Aid Clinic	29
Other	20

Teachers reported other services which included: Speech therapy (3), hearing therapy (1), transportation to and cost of consulting ophthalmologist (1), physical therapy (1), tutors-readers (1), ophthalmological consultant (1), and full services from BVH (3).

Preschool Services

Teachers who did not serve preschool children reported agencies which did serve preschool children, including: private social agencies (36%), state rehabilitation agencies (13%), and other such as preschool projects which were conducted by the I.U.'s and which included visually handicapped children (27%).

Procurement of Materials

The majority (86%) reported that the itinerant teacher of the visually handicapped arranged for the procurement of materials for the children. Table VII lists others who arranged for the materials, tabulated by percentages of teachers reporting each category.

TABLE VII

PROCUREMENT OF MATERIALS

Arranged By	Percent of Teachers
Itinerant teacher of visually handicapped	86
Instructional Materials Center	27
Instructional Materials Specialist	20
Head Teacher or Supervisor	10
School Purchasing Agent	10
Other	5

Four teachers (5%) reported that they worked with a secretary, who did the actual arranging.

Allocation of Time

Itinerant teachers of academic subjects and those employed as teachers of academic subjects and orientation and mobility both, reported the percentage of time involved in each activity as shown in Table VIII. Teachers of orientation and mobility only, reported more time spent in direct instruction of children, as reflected also in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGES OF TIME INVOLVED WITH ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	Percent of Time Academic	Percent of Time O&M
Direct contact with parents	2.85	1.00
Direct instruction of children	59.17	74.00
Direct contact with regular classroom teachers	4.50	1.33
Procurement & construction of materials	6.62	2.33
Consultation with other professional personnel	2.60	1.00
Direction of volunteers	0.34	0
Consultation with community agencies	0.81	0.33
Collecting information on referrals	2.96	0.67
Administration (reports, meetings etc.)	4.55	1.00
Driving	16.49	0.33

Nine teachers reported other activities which included: lesson preparation (10%), check vision and for perception problems as requested by psychologists, direction of aide (5%), miscellaneous clerical (2%), testing (6.6%), talks to interested classes about braille, blindness, etc. (less than 1%).

Functions

The teachers were requested to indicate the numbers of children for whom they performed the functions which had been identified according to the grade level and severity of handicapping conditions of the children. The charts on the following pages list the results of these reports. The numbers of children on a total caseload for whom a function is performed does not necessarily indicate the percentage of teacher's time allotted to the function, as may be revealed by a comparison of these lists with Table VIII. The lists, do indicate, however, the anticipated functions which will be necessary for children on the caseload.

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SEVERELY MULTIHANDICAPPED VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

Collect Medical Information
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Observe Child in School Setting

83.4% to All Children on Active Case Load

Assess Visual Functioning

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Parents
Suggest Environmental Modifications to Regular Classroom Teacher
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning of Child to Regular Classroom Teacher

50.1% to 66.6% on Active Case Load

Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Assess Listening Ability
Consult with Nurse

33.4% to 50% on Active Case Load

Consult with School Psychologist
Locate and Procure Materials
Assess Independence in Travel
Teach Listening
Teach Utilization of Low Vision
Assess Social Skills

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SEVERELY MULTIHANDICAPPED VISUAL LEARNERS (Continued)

16.7% to 33.3% on Active Case Load

Teach Motor Skills
Observe Child in Home
Prepare Education Plan for Regular Teacher
Prepare Materials for Classroom
Consult with Social Worker
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Provide Guidance toward Personal and Social Adjustment
Teach Reading
Assess Study Skills
Teach Social Skills
Provide Models and Real Objects for Classroom Use
Assess Reading Performance
Assess Mathematics Performance

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SEVERELY MULTIHANDICAPPED NON VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

None

83.4% to All Children on Active Case Load

None

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Parents
Observe Child in School Setting

50.1% to 66.6% on Active Case Load

Teach Listening
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Assess Social Skills
Collect Medical Information

33.4% to 50% on Active Case Load

Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Consult with Nurse
Teach Social Skills
Prepare Materials for Classroom Use
Teach Orientation and Independent Travel
Locate and Procure Materials
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning of Child to Classroom Teacher
Assess Independence in Travel
Provide Guidance toward Personal and Social Adjustment

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SEVERELY MULTIHANDICAPPED NON VISUAL LEARNERS (Continued)

16.7% to 33.4% on Active Case Load

Teach Motor Skills
Teach Use of Tangible Aids
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Suggest Environmental Modifications to Regular Classroom Teacher
Assess Listening Ability
Consult with School Psychologist
Observe Child in Home

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Prepare Education Plan for Teacher
Teach Mathematics
Assess Study Skills
Assess Visual Functioning
Teach Reading
Consult with Social Worker
Assess Reading Performance
Teach Optacon

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR PRE SCHOOL VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

Consult with Parents

83.4% to All Children on Active Case Load

Collect Medical Information

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Consult with Nurse
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Assess Visual Functioning
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning of Child to Classroom Teacher

50.1% to 66.6% on Active Case Load

Observe Child in School Setting

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Suggest Environmental Modifications to Classroom Teacher
Assess Listening Ability
Locate and Procure Materials
Teach Listening
Assess Social Skills
Teach Motor Skills
Consult with School Psychologist

16.7% to 33.3% on Active Case Load

Assess Independence in Travel
Observe Child in Home
Consult with Social Worker
Assess Reading Performance
Teach Reading
Teach Utilization of Low Vision

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR PRE-SCHOOL VISUAL LEARNERS

(Continued)

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Prepare Materials for Classroom
Teach Mathematics
Teach Social Skills
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance of Handicapped Child
Provide Guidance toward Personal and Social Adjustment
Teach Use of Tangible Aids
Assess Study Skills

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR PRE-SCHOOL NON VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

None

83.4% to all Children on Active Case Load

Consult with Parents

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Observe Child in Home

50.1% to 66.7% on Active Case Load

Collect Medical Information

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Assess Independence in Travel
Assess Social Skills

16.7% to 33.4% on Active Case Load

Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Locate and Procure Materials
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance of Handicapped Child
Assess Listening Ability
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Consult with Social Worker
Observe Child in School Setting
Teach Social Skills

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Prepare Materials for Classroom Use
Consult with Nurse
Assess Visual Functioning
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning of Child to Classroom Teacher
Provide Models and Real Objects
Consult with School Psychologist
Suggest Environmental Modifications

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

Consult with Classroom Teacher
Collect Medical Information
Consult with Nurse

83.4% to all Children on Active Case Load

Suggest Environmental Modifications to Classroom Teacher
Interpret Medical Information to Classroom Teacher
Assess Visual Functioning

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Principal and other Administrators
Consult with Parents
Observe Child in School Setting
Teach Reading

50.1% to 66.7% on Active Case Load

Assess Reading Performance
Locate and Procure Materials
Teach Listening
Assess Listening Ability

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Teach Mathematics
Assess Study Skills
Assess Social Skills
Consult with School Psychologist
Assess Independence in Travel
Assess Mathematics Performance
Provide Guidance toward Personal and Social Adjustment

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY VISUAL LEARNERS

(Continued)

16.7% to 33.3% on Active Case Load

Teach Utilization of Low Vision
Consult with Guidance Counselor
Prepare Materials for Classroom Use
Teach Study Skills, Use of Library, Readers, Recordings
Teach Motor Skills
Teach Social Studies

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Consult with Social Worker or Case Worker
Teach Social Skills
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Prepare Education Plan for Regular Teacher
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance
Observe Child in Home
Provide Models and Real Objects for Regular Classroom Teacher
Administer and Score Standard Achievement Test
Teach Typing
Teach Science
Teach Use of Tangible Aids

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY NON VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

None

83.4% to all Children on Active Case Load

None

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Classroom Teacher
Observe Child in School Setting

50.1% to 66.7% on Active Case Load

Consult with Parents
Teach Reading
Collect Medical Information
Consult with Principal or Administrative Personnel
Locate and Procure Materials
Provide Models and Real Objects for Regular Classroom Teachers
Prepare Materials for Classroom Use

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Consult with Nurse
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning to Classroom Teacher
Assess Independence in Travel
Teach Listening
Provide Guidance toward Personal Adjustment

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY NON VISUAL LEARNERS

(Continued)

16.7% to 33.4% on Active Case Load

Consult with School Psychologist
Observe Child in Home
Assess Social Skills
Suggest Environmental Modifications
Assess Listening Ability
Teach Use of Abacus
Assess Reading Performance
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance
Prepare Education Plan for Regular Teacher
Assess Mathematics Performance
Assess Study Skills
Teach Social Skills
Teach Mathematics
Teach Orientation and Independent Travel
Teach Use of Tangible Aids

0% to 16.7% on Active Case Load

Teach Reading with the Optacon
Teach Typing
Assess Visual Functioning
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Teach Motor Skills
Teach Study Skills, Use of Library Readers, Recordings
Teach Child about Vocational Opportunities
Teach Reading of Music
Teach Child to Independently acquire Specialized Materials
Administer and Score Standard Achievement Test
Teach Utilization of Low Vision

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SECONDARY VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

Collect Medical Information
Consult with Nurse
Consult with Guidance Counselor
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Suggest Environmental Modifications to Classroom Teacher
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning of Child to Teacher

33.4% to all Children on Active Case Load

None

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Assess Visual Functioning
Consult with Parents
Locate and Procure Materials

50.1% to 66.6% on Active Case Load

Provide Guidance toward Personal Adjustment
Observe Child in School Setting
Assess Study Skills

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Assess Listening Ability
Consult with School Psychologist
Assess Social Skills
Assess Reading Performance
Teach Child about Vocational Opportunities
Teach Study Skills, Use of Library Readers, Recordings
Assess Independence in Travel

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SECONDARY VISUAL LEARNERS

(Continued)

16.7% to 33.3% on Active Case Load

Teach Mathematics
Teach Listening
Assess Mathematics Performance
Teach Reading
Consult with Vocational Counselors
Teach Child to Independently Acquire Specialized Materials
Teach Typing
Prepare Materials for Classroom
Teach Social Studies

0% to 16.6% on Active Case Load

Teach Sciences
Teach Social Skills
Consult with Social Worker
Teach Utilization of Low Vision
Teach Use of Tangible Aids
Administer and Score Achievement Tests
Prepare Education Plan for Regular Teacher
Prepare Child and New School
Observe Child in Home
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Provide Models and Real Objects for Classroom

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SECONDARY NON VISUAL LEARNERS

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED FOR:

All Children on Case Load

None

83.4% to all Children on Active Case Load

Consult with Parents
Provide Guidance toward Personal and Social Adjustment

66.7% to 83.3% on Active Case Load

Consult with Guidance Counselor
Consult with Classroom Teacher
Locate and Procure Materials
Collect Medical Information
Consult with Principal or other Administrative Personnel
Assess Independence in Travel

50.1% to 66.6% on Active Case Load

Consult with Vocational Counselors
Arrange for Readers
Assess Mathematics Performance
Observe Child in School Setting
Teach Child to Independently acquire Materials
Teach Use of Tangible Aids
Consult with Nurse
Assess Social Skills

33.4% to 50.0% on Active Case Load

Teach Study Skills
Prepare Materials for Classroom Use
Assess Visual Functioning
Interpret Medical Information and Visual Functioning to Classroom Teacher
Consult with Social Worker
Consult with School Psychologist
Teach Reading with the Optacon

Continued .....

RANKED RATINGS OF FUNCTIONS FOR SECONDARY NON VISUAL LEARNERS

(Continued)

16.7% to 33.3% on Active Case Load

Suggest Environmental Modifications to Regular Classroom Teacher
Assess Study Skills
Teach Mathematics
Teach Typing
Teach Reading
Assess Listening Ability
Teach Social Skills
Teach Listening
Provide Models and Real Objects
Prepare Child and New School for Entrance
Teach Activities of Daily Living
Teach Use of Abacus

0% to 16.6% on Active Case Load

Arrange for Readers
Teach pre-vocational Skills
Assess Reading Performance
Consult with Volunteers
Teach Social Studies
Teach Sciences
Teach Utilization of Low Vision

Additional Functions

Teachers were requested to indicate functions which they performed in addition to their responsibilities for children on their caseloads. Table IX indicated the percentages of the itinerant teachers who reported each function.

TABLE IX

ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS

Functions	Percent of Teachers
Review referral materials	86
Periodically review children not requiring regular service	82
Make referrals to appropriate persons for auxiliary services needed for children	82
Participate in recommendations of placement of children in other programs	71
Review placement of children in other programs (residential school, special classroom, etc.)	54
Make speeches, give demonstrations, etc. for community organizations	48
Conduct formal and/or informal in-service training for regular classroom teachers, nurses, and other school personnel	37.5
Give homebound instruction	36
Arrange opportunities for extra-curricular activities and after school activities	29
Participate in school vision screening	23
Participate in medical-psychological-instructor teams	20

Teachers were requested to add any additional functions which they performed which had not appeared on the questionnaire. The following were reported:

"Any child for whom a psychologist recommends visual examination is channeled through the vision department...an evaluation done and a recommendation made as to the needs of the child. A single evaluation can take up to three hours (this includes consultation time, not follow-up)."

"Weekend and 'after-school' instruction averaging eight hours/week."

"Arrange for opthalmological, optometrical, perceptual examinations and often accompany the child with parent or guardian."

"The children that I test may be nurses' referrals that are not visually handicapped but need to be sent to an eye doctor. -- Normal, Special Ed., Physically Handicapped. It is our job to also test (vision screening) all children referred into learning disabilities classes -- normal L.D. child."

"I have secured from Lions clubs, tape recorders, large print typewriters, etc. for students who needed these machines at home as well as at school. Schools seem to think that as long as these are made available in school area, this is their duty."

"Sensory stimulation programs, staff meetings, record keeping (clerical) not only of travel, but also for each student seen and what was done each day. So much time spent seeking out new ways to approach a task that are quick and feasible for itinerant."

"Provide transportation to medical (eye) appointments."

"Reading readiness (kindergarten skills), visual motor skills, telling time, cursive writing, handwriting skills, body image, consult with special teachers (speech, art, gym)."

Continued .....

I endeavor to prepare every regular teacher for any v/h child she may have by making her aware of eye problem, why, cause and progression - how she can help child and keep me aware of needs.

Prepare materials for use with me such as games, worksheets, handwriting practice pages, typing practice pages etc.

Interpret to classmates, child's problems and assets and how they can help.

Teach handwriting.

TEACHER-CONSULTANTS

The ten teachers who identified their role as teacher-consultants according to the given definitions, reported such differing types of case loads that no group analysis was possible. The reports were:

1. A teacher-consultant for 31 children, all multihandicapped, who were also in other special programs.
2. A teacher who reported: "As head teacher, I spend 60% administrating and coordinating and 40% teacher. I am enclosing a copy of our program description for your information..."
3. A teacher who defined his/her role as teacher-consultant, indicated 55% of time in direct instruction, and reported teaching reading and utilization of low vision only, to one-fourth of case load.
4. Seven teachers, each of whom annotated the report: "While our program closely resembles that defined above as 'Teacher-consultant plan', we are referred to as 'itinerant teachers' and perform many of the functions implied by that definition. So that you may have as complete a picture as possible of my particular function within the many-faceted program of...I am completing any portions of this form which deal specifically with duties I perform regularly."

From an analysis of the reported functions of the seven teachers referred to in #4 above, it appeared that case loads were distributed as follows:

Teacher #1:	51 severely multihandicapped non-academic visual learners 50 severely multihandicapped non-academic non-visual learners (All in a state school and hospital or in special classrooms, one homebound)
Teacher #2:	53 secondary visual learners 2 secondary non-visual learners
Teacher #3:	116 elementary visual learners
Teacher #4	64 secondary visual learners 1 secondary non-visual learner
Teacher #5:	4 elementary non-visual learners 1 secondary non-visual learner (Optacon instruction only)

Teacher #6:	32 secondary visual learners
	1 secondary non-visual learner
Teacher #7:	1 severely multihandicapped non-visual learner
	2 preschool visual learners
	2 preschool non-visual learners
	5 elementary visual learners
	5 elementary non-visual learners
	(Orientation and mobility only)

In general, functions which were reported varied in relation to the type of children on each caseload. Since only one program was involved, no further analysis was performed.

RURAL VS. SUBURBAN-URBAN ITINERANT TEACHERS

The programs and functions of itinerant teachers who served large (rural) geographic areas (N = 21), were analyzed in comparison with programs and functions of itinerant teachers who served smaller (suburban-urban) geographic areas (N = 32).

The total average caseload of rural teachers was 20, while that of suburban-urban teachers was 18. There were no differences, however, in the numbers of children on the caseloads who required regular service. More suburban-urban teachers reported that they had responsibilities for preschool visual learners, preschool non-visual learners, and severely multihandicapped non-academic learners, than rural teachers. Tables X, XI, and XII list those reported.

TABLE X

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN ON CASELOAD

Program - Learners	Averages	
	Rural	Suburban-Urban
Preschool visual	0.286	0.563
Preschool non-visual	0.143	0.313
Elementary visual	11.143	10.031
Elementary non-visual	0.238	0.219
Secondary visual	6.952	5.969
Secondary non-visual	0.238	0.406
Severely multihandicapped visual	0.857	0.469
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	0.190	0.156
TOTAL.....	20.047	18.126

TABLE XI

TEACHERS REPORTING CHILDREN ON CASELOAD

Program - Learners	Percent of Teachers	
	Rural	Suburban-Urban
Preschool visual	19	37.5
Preschool non-visual	9.5	19
Elementary visual	86	87.5
Elementary non-visual	19	16
Secondary visual	81	84
Secondary non-visual	24	25
Severely multihandicapped visual	24	31
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	14	12.5

TABLE XII

CHILDREN WHO REQUIRED REGULAR SERVICE

Program - Learners	Averages	
	Rural	Suburban-Urban
Preschool visual	0.143	0.344
Preschool non-visual	0.048	0.125
Elementary visual	7.667	7 750
Elementary non-visual	0.190	0.250
Secondary visual	3.762	3.656
Secondary non-visual	0.190	0.313
Severely multihandicapped visual	0.571	0.281
Severely multihandicapped non-visual	0.143	0.156
TOTAL.....	12.710	12.875

In patterns of referrals and procurement of materials, no differences were found between the two programs. Teachers in suburban-urban programs reported that more social work counseling, psychological counseling, and low-vision aid clinic services were available to the children and parents than were reported by rural teachers.

There appeared to be differences in the allocation of time by the teachers in the two programs. Rural teachers spent more of their time in direct instruction of children than suburban-urban teachers, and less in consultation with parents, community agencies and other professional personnel. A comparison is reported in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGES OF TIME INVOLVED WITH ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	PERCENT OF TIME	
	Rural Teachers	Suburban-Urban Teachers
Direct contact with parents	1.619	3.656
Direct instruction of children	62.524	56.969
Direct contact with regular classroom teachers	3.905	4.875
Procurement & construction of materials	6.000	7.031
Consultation with other professional personnel	1.810	3.125
Direction of colunteers	0.190	0.438
Consultation with community agencies	0.524	1.000
Collecting information on referrals	2.619	3.188
Administration	3.762	5.063
Driving	16.381	16.563

Teachers were requested to describe children other than visually handicapped for whom they had responsibilities and, again, the percentage of their time which was allocated to functions other than listed. Teachers from rural areas reported that they were responsible for assessment and/or instruction of children who had Learning Disabilities or Perception Problems. None of the suburban-urban teachers reported such responsibilities.

The numbers of children who were enrolled in preschool programs and in programs for the severely multihandicapped non-academic students, and the numbers of teachers who were involved were considered to be too few for any comparison to be made between the groups. An analysis of the functions performed for other children, however, revealed:

Elementary visual learners: Suburban-urban teachers prepared and procured materials, and consulted with parents, for a larger percentage of their caseload than rural teachers. Other functions did not differ.

Elementary non-visual learners: Suburban-urban teachers provided instruction to a larger percentage of their caseload than rural teachers in Optacon, social skills, mathematics, activities of daily living, listening, typing, motor skills, study skills, use of tangible aids, vocational opportunities, and independent acquisition of specialized materials. They also prepared and procured materials, and provided guidance toward personal and social adjustment for a larger percentage.

Rural teachers assessed reading and mathematics performance for a larger percentage of their case loads than suburban-urban teachers. Other functions did not differ.

Secondary visual learners: Suburban-urban teachers consulted with parents and administrative personnel, and taught independent acquisition of specialized materials to a larger percentage of their caseload than rural teachers. Other functions did not differ.

Secondary non-visual learners: Suburban-urban teachers observed in the school setting and in the home, taught social skills, provided models for the children, consulted with volunteers and prepared children and new school for entrance of handicapped children for a larger percentage of their caseload than rural teachers.

Rural teachers assessed mathematics performance, taught Optacon, mathematics, and consulted with vocational counselors for a larger percentage of their caseloads than suburban-urban teachers. Other functions did not differ.

IV. DISCUSSION

The functions which were performed for elementary and secondary school aged children, as reported by the teachers, supported both the Jones and Bertram definition of the role of the itinerant teacher, in that "individual supplemental instruction and the teaching of specific skills made necessary by the child's handicapping condition" and "special materials which he receives from a traveling special teacher, who trains him in their use and counsels with him on how to handle his problem" have all been provided. These functions can be discussed as they apply to four broad areas: general administration of program; management of educational environment; specific skills of communication and personal competency; and vocational skills.

General Administration of Programs. Itinerant teachers reported an average of approximately 59% of their time in direct instruction of children, 11% in consultation relating to the children, and 16.5% driving. The remaining 13.5% of their time was utilized in administrative duties such as procuring materials, record keeping, meetings, revieving referral materials, and screening referrals. Many teachers reported that they spent one-half day per week in central locations, but some of the administrative functions were performed before the time to see the first child in the morning and/or after they finished with the last child in the evening, from the particular school where they happened to be.

Management of Educational Environment: Approximately 11% of the teachers time was needed for consultation with other personnel who had responsibilities concerning the children. For the elementary students, only the school nurse and classroom teacher appeared to comprise the team concerned with the child. For secondary children, not only the school nurse and classroom teachers, but the guidance counselor, principal and other administrative personnel were involved.

Despite the report that 92% of the teachers reported that psychological testing was available, and 43% reported that psychological counseling was available, teachers appeared to consult with the school psychologist for only about one-third of their students. Referrals came most often from school nurses who were in a position to identify through visual screening those children in need of service; however, in view of the present trend to involve the school psychologist in the educational problems of children with learning and mental handicaps, it is interesting that children with visual handicaps still appear to be a "medical problem" in the schools.

Most of the teachers were responsible for the procurement and production of needed materials, and approximately 7% of their time was allotted to this. More than one-half of the elementary visual and non-visual learners, and more than two-thirds of the secondary visual and non-visual learners were supplied with special materials by their itinerant teachers. Some programs reported that others, such as supervisors, head teachers, and, in the larger programs, Instructional Materials Specialists (Pennsylvania)

supported paraprofessional positions for programs for the visually handicapped), procured the needed materials.

Specific Skills of Communication and Personal Competency: Although 32% of the teachers reported that remedial reading services were available, itinerant teachers were teaching reading to more than two-third of the elementary visual learners, more than two-third of the elementary non-visual learners, slightly less than one-half of the secondary visual learners, and less than one-half of the secondary visual learners and less than one-third of the secondary visual learners. In mathematics, less than one-half of the elementary visual learners, and less than one-third of the elementary non-visual learners, secondary visual and non-visual learners received instruction in mathematics from the itinerant teacher. Since research has clearly indicated that, in general, visually handicapped children fall below the average in math achievement, this finding may further indicate the importance which is placed upon print or braille reading achievement in the schools.

In comparison, teachers reported that they assessed and taught listening skills to approximately one-half of the elementary visual learners and approximately one-third of the elementary non-visual learners, and secondary visual and non-visual learners. An assumption could be made that this instruction was included in study skills: use of library, readers, recordings, etc., but analysis revealed that less than one-third of the elementary visual learners, virtually none of the elementary non-visual learners and less than one-half of the secondary visual and non-visual learners received this instruction.

Teachers reported that they taught typing to virtually none of the elementary visual and non-visual learners, and less than one-third of the secondary visual and non-visual learners. Further study should be conducted to establish if this important skill is developed through regular classroom teaching, especially for the elementary non-visual learners.

Teachers collected medical information for all of the elementary and secondary visual learners, for only one-half of the elementary non-visual learners and two-thirds of the secondary visual learners. They assessed the visual functioning of all of the elementary visual learners and over two-thirds of the secondary visual learners, none of the elementary non-visual learners and less than one-half of the secondary non-visual learners. Utilization of low vision was taught to less than one-third of the elementary visual learners, and virtually none of the elementary non-visual learners, nor secondary visual or non-visual learners. Further study of this important area should be conducted to investigate, e.g., how decisions are made to classify children as visual or non-visual learners.

It was not apparent that ancillary services were provided to children and their parents to develop daily living skills such as eating, dressing, grooming, homemaking and functional use of everyday materials and equipment in the home, and teachers reported that they taught these skills to less than one-sixth of the elementary non-visual learners and less than one-third of the secondary non-visual learners.

It is apparent from the above, that the curriculum areas which are specific to visually handicapped children are not emphasized as much as the general academic skills such as reading and mathematics.

In the areas of personal competency such as social interaction with other people and self-adjustment, teachers reported that they provided guidance to one-half of the elementary visual and non-visual learners, more than one-half of the secondary visual learners, and all of the secondary non-visual learners. Very little vocational counseling was done, however 61% of the teachers reported that vocational counseling services were available to the children and their parents as an ancillary service.

The functions which were performed for pre-school children and severely multi-handicapped children were generally related to management of educational environment. For less than one-third of these children, instruction in utilization of low vision and activities of daily living was provided. Orientation and mobility teachers provided instruction to non-visual, severely multi-handicapped non-academic students. Consultation only, in the main, was provided by the itinerant teachers.

The comparison of the functions performed by teachers in rural areas and teachers in urban-suburban areas revealed that rural teachers reported a larger percentage of time allocated to teaching, but less time teaching in curriculum areas specific to visually handicapped children. Rural teachers reported that they

were more involved with assessment and/or teaching of children with learning disabilities or visual perception problems, than were suburban-urban teachers. Interestingly, exactly the same percentage of time was allotted to driving by the suburban-urban teachers as by the rural teachers.

To approach definite conclusions from this study, two points of view could be considered. Itinerant teaching programs have been in existence for many years and it is evident that most children educated under this administrative plan "make it", that is, they progress through the grades, graduate, and many go on to higher education, and it would be a fair assumption to make that itinerant teachers have performed the functions which met the needs of the children. On the other hand, the itinerant teachers may be performing functions which are prescribed for them by classroom teachers and administrative personnel and the children's needs would be met even better if teachers were afforded the time and opportunity to perform other functions such as instructing students in the areas more specific in their handicapping condition. The purpose of this study was to establish, from the teachers' own reports, their daily functioning as a first step toward further study which now should be addressed to investigation of such questions as:

1. If the one greatest area of need for visually handicapped children is in reading, are the preservice preparation programs developing the necessary competencies in the teachers?

2. If most of the children benefit from specialized management of their educational environments, are teachers being prepared to work with the team of nurse, classroom teacher, administrative personnel, psychologist, guidance counselor to direct this management?
3. If consultation with other concerned personnel is most effective for most of the children, are teachers allotted sufficient flexibility and time in their schedules to do so?
4. Should preschool and primary children receive more intensive instruction in reading by the itinerant teachers to prevent the necessity for later remedial help?
5. If there is a need for more curriculum materials to be produced which teachers could utilize for instruction of the specific skills needed by the visually handicapped, such as listening, utilization of low vision, activities of daily living, etc.?
6. What factors, other than adolescence, make most secondary school aged children need intensive guidance toward personal adjustment, and are itinerant teachers being prepared to give this guidance?
7. Should schedules for visually handicapped children be adjusted to allow for instruction in specialized areas, even at the cost of academic skills for periods?
8. Should instruction in specialized areas be <u>required</u> for visually handicapped children?

9. Should the teachers' responsibilities in Vocational Guidance be identified and such competencies be a part of the pre-service programs?

10. Based on teachers' reports of that which is taught (Example - non-visual learners are not receiving instruction in utilization of low vision or listening) should the criteria for making a decision as to whether a child is considered visual or non-visual be examined?

11. Since children with visual handicaps still appear to be considered "medical problems", should School Psychologists and Administration receive more in-service education relating to programs for the education of the visually handicapped?

These and other questions arise not only from the analysis of data, but from expressed concerns of some of the itinerant teachers which were solicited through this study and the previous critical incidence study.

A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF A TYPICAL ITINERANT TEACHER OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PENNSYLVANIA

A functional description of a "typical" itinerant teacher of visually handicapped children may be derived from data representing the averages of reports by participating teachers and critical incidents reported in the previous study.

In an average week, the teacher spends 19-1/4 hours in direct instruction of children, 1-1/2 hours consulting with regular classroom teachers, 2-1/4 hours in procurement and construction of materials, 2 hours in consultation with parents, other professional personnel, volunteers or community agencies, 2-1/2 hours in administrative duties (reports, meetings, etc.) or collecting information on referrals, and 5-1/4 hours driving in addition to driving to the first school in the mornings and home from the last school in the afternoons.

The teacher is serving children in an area considered to be predominantly suburban-urban. Most referrals come from school nurses, classroom teachers and principals. Services which are available to the children and parents, in addition, include psychological testing, remedial reading services, vocational counseling, and perhaps social work counseling. The teacher is responsible for the procurement of materials for the children with whom he/she works.

Nineteen children are on the teachers total caseload and the teacher collects medical information and information from school records, such as age, grade, and/or reading level, for all of them. Eleven of these children are elementary visual learners, six are

secondary learners, one is either a pre-school visual learner, or a severely multihandicapped visual learner who is in another special program, and one is a non-visual learner, most probably at the secondary level. Only thirteen of these children require regular service; eight of the elementary visual learners, four of the secondary visual learners, and the one non-visual learner. Six children are visited infrequently during the year for checking only.

For all eight of the elementary visual learners who require regular service, the teacher consults with the classroom teacher and school nurse; assesses visual functioning of the child, and interprets medical information and visual functioning of the child to the regular classroom teacher . . .*

> *Had conference with teacher on needs of a new visually handicapped student entering her class. (Effective)*
>
> *Was unable to be at a school when teacher was available for conference. (Ineffective)*
>
> *Had conference with teacher on uses of large print under certain conditions. (Effective)*
>
> *Was unable to convince administrator of the total facets of the program. (Ineffective)*
>
> *Had conference with student and teacher on completion of daily assignments. (Effective)*
>
> *Tried to interpret medical form for partially seeing sixth grade student for principal. (Ineffective)*

The teacher observes seven of these children in the school classroom and consults with the principal and parents . . .

> *Had home visit with mother to reassure her and explain school program; results changed child's feelings and he improved in school. (Effective)*

*Italicized statements were taken from teachers' reported "effective" and "ineffective" Critical Incidents in previous study.

Tried to convince school district that a child should be brought home from residential school even over parents' protests. (Ineffective)

Had conference with mother on kinds of behaviors that would be expected of her child as he changed from an elementary classroom to a large junior high. (Effective)

Advised parents not to have their first grader learn braille until absolutely necessary in spite of doctor's recommendation; two years later child is still doing well with large print. (Effective)

Could not get teachers to accept same quality of work from students as from normal students. (Ineffective)

Was unable to show school personnel and parents of slow learner who has repeated twice that child should not be placed two years ahead because of physical maturity; she could not do work and now is being taken out of school each afternoon for vision retraining at a hospital. (Ineffective)

The teacher assesses the reading skills and teaches reading to five of the children . . .

Made evaluation of student; discovered she was well below her level and placed her in a special reading class. (Effective)

Worked with student at school districts insistence although girl did not want any help and resented being taken from class. (Ineffective)

Examined picture of a rainbow with a partially seeing fifth grader who could not see a real one and whose reading assignment required her knowing what one was. (Effective)

Could not motivate second grader during a reading lesson. (Ineffective)

The teacher, in addition, locates and procures materials and assesses and teaches listening skills to four of these children . . .

Prepared copies of poorly done ditto sheets for a partially-seeing student to use. (Effective)

Supplied books which were never unwrapped. (Ineffective)

Obtained books for student as extra reading in science. (Effective)

Delivered books and materials during week prior to first day of school. (Effective)

Delivered large print book which was not used because copyright was different; book contained only slight differences in text. (Ineffective)

Ordered large print books for student at M.D.'s recommendation; student refused to use them. (Ineffective)

Taught listening lessons, use of tape recorder, and note-taking. (Effective)

Obtained copy of large print achievement test which teacher had had the partially seeing student take in regular print. (Ineffective)

Three of these children also require assessment of mathematic skills and teaching in mathematics, assessment of study skills, social skills and independence in travel. For these three, the teacher also consults with the school psychologist and provides guidance toward personal and social adjustment . . .

Provided reinforcement in working simple math problems to a visually-hearing impaired slow learner. (Effective)

Worked with child only once a week on math; attribute lack of success to working with child only once a week. (Ineffective)

Helped clarify some conceptual problems relating to math of a second grader. (Effective)

Accompanied class on a field trip and described sights to the visually handicapped student in the class. (Effective)

Took child for walk to see things and play with bugs, leaves, seeds, etc. (Effective)

Tested student with Slosson test; hadn't been done for six years. (Effective)

Provided alternative materials to a ditto sheet emphasis in math study. (Effective)

Worked with uncooperative student twice a week for one hour at insistence of school district. (Ineffective)

One of the children, in addition, requires instruction in utilization of low vision, preparation of special materials, and instruction in study skills (use of library, readers, recordings, etc.) and motor skills.

Arranged for partially seeing student to use films and remote control projector for supplementary materials. (Effective)

Enlarged typing drills on 3M transparencies for use by several students with an overhead projector. (Effective)

Had English book done in large type. (Ineffective)

Used playing ball to improve eye-hand coordination. (Effective)

For all of the secondary visual learners, the teacher collects medical information, consults nurses, guidance counselors and classroom teachers . . .

Had conference with guidance counselor in junior high on services to be provided for a new partially seeing student. (Effective)

Discussed personal Army experiences with a junior high counselor. (Ineffective)

Worked with teacher who taught students as a class, not as individuals. (Effective)

Observed gradual visual loss in student; referred student for eye exam through parents---detached retina. (Effective)

The teacher, for at least three and perhaps four of the children who required regular service, suggests environmental modifications, (seating arrangement, lighting, etc.) to the regular classroom teacher, assesses visual functioning, consults with the principal or other administrator, and locates and procures material . . .

Worked with guidance counselors and teachers to alert them to problems of a visually handicapped student and to enlarge materials he would need. (Effective)

Presented partially seeing student with large print books in front of some of her classmates, she refused them -- she didn't want the others to see them. (Ineffective)

Recommended use of talking books by student for supplementary work in history. (Effective)

Ordered and delivered books to student who then refused to use them. (Ineffective)

The teacher observes two of these youngsters in the school setting, assesses study skills and provides guidance toward personal and social adjustment . . .

Taught student how to write friendly letter and to address envelope. (Effective)

Tried to get mentally ill high school student to go to Mental Hygiene where he had been previously referred. (Ineffective)

Taught personal typing to partially seeing student and noted attitude change. (Effective)

Had several discussions with a high school student about drugs and alcohol. (Effective)

Answered questions on birth control asked by a 16 year old partially seeing girl about to be married. (Effective)

Was forced to go over homework with student when what he needed was remedial work. (Ineffective)

Read to student without knowing purpose of assignment. (Ineffective)

Served as sounding board to relieve student's emotional, social and educational problems. (Effective)

For one child, in addition, the teacher assesses listening ability, social skills and reading performance, teaches study skills and teaches the child about vocational opportunities, after consultation with the school psychologist.

Helped student to decide to attend the vocational technical school. (Effective)

Failed to convince student to stay in school and school to let student in vo-tech curriculum. (Ineffective)

Arranged for another student in vocational rehab to discuss advantages of rehab program with student in high school who had rejected being referred and receiving services. (Effective)

Made referrals to Bureau of Visually and Physically Handicapped. (Effective)

For the one secondary non-visual learner, the teacher collects medical information, locates and procures materials, consults with the classroom teacher, vocational counselor, nurse, guidance counselor, principal and parents . . .

Had teacher-principal conference to persuade them to include blind student in spring fashion show. (Effective)

Had conferences with administration to arrange for admission of a blind student into a technical school computer programming course. (Effective)

Brailled history test for student who was made exempt from final. (Ineffective)

Arranged for administration of College Boards for 11th grader braille student--involved conferences with counselor, principal, and proctor. (Effective)

Encouraged blind student to submit her poems to a national children's magazine-published. (Effective)

Failed to convince "newly blinded" adolescent she needed to learn braille. (Ineffective)

Gave materials to volunteer along with directions as to format, work was not done properly and had to be redone. (Ineffective)

The teacher also assesses independence in travel and social skills, arranges for readers, and teaches the child the use of tangible aids and how to independently acquire materials . . .

Arranged for braille student to have reader service to prepare her for debate team; did some research myself for student and brailled information for her use. (Effective)

Provided tangible aids to a blind geometry student but teacher moved not to use them. (Ineffective)

Used cut-out figures with blind student to teach geometric shapes and their superimposition. (Effective)

Felt ineffective in trying to help blind student create graph for required problems. (Ineffective)

For the one child who may be in a pre-school or in a program for severely multihandicapped children, the teacher will, on a regular basis, observe the child in the school setting, assess visual functioning, consult with the parents and classroom teacher and interpret medical information and visual functioning, and suggest environmental modifications to the classroom teacher . . .

Tried to suggest projects for a teacher to use with a non-verbal very active partially seeing boy in a trainable class. (Effective)

Could not make trainable parents of trainable child understand my purpose in coming to talk with them. (Ineffective)

Used counting frame to teach blind retarded homebound boy about money; frame became toy; should have used money. (Ineffective)

Devised system of using poker chips as money to reward retarded blind child for his success in working two place addition problems. (Effective)

Gave guidance department of a school district a push to get their mentally retarded student in vocational technical school despite his first rejection by the vocational technical school (Effective)

In addition to these regular services, the teacher will, on an infrequent basis, review referral materials, periodically review

children not requiring regular services, make referrals to appropriate persons for auxiliary service needed for the children, review placement of children in other programs, and participate in recommendations for placement of children in other programs. Perhaps she/he may, very occasionally, conduct in-service programs for school personnel or make speeches for community organizations such as Lions Club, Kiwanis, etc.

Set up program with town women's club to provide social enrichment for blind students. (Effective)

Tried to find student who moved five times in seven weeks. (Ineffective)

Arranged for local Lion's Club to purchase a tape recorder I had recommended for a needy blind student in high school. (Effective)

Gave opinion on placement of second grader - fail him, child repeated, improved, and no longer is on program. (Effective)

Spent time evaluating first grader whose visual acuity was later to be reported as 20/40. (Ineffective)

Talked a youngster and his parents into submitting to surgery which they previously had avoided and thereby helped a child see well enough to go off program. (Effective)

Spoke to class on blindness at teacher's request. (Effective)

Arrived at school to discover my student was absent. (Ineffective)

Typed and composed letters which could have been done by a secretary. (Ineffective)

APPENDIX

REFERENCES

Abel, Georgia Lee. Concerning the Education of Blind Children. New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1959. Education Series #12.

American Foundation for the Blind. Itinerant Teaching Service for Blind Children Proceedings of a National Work Session Held at Bear Mountain, New York, August 20-24, 1956, New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1957. Group Report #5.

American Foundation for the Blind, A Teacher Education Program for those who Serve Blind Children and Youth. New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1961.

Bertram, Fredericka. The Education of Partially Sighted Children, in W.M. Cruickshank and G.O. Johnson (eds.), Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958, pp. 265-294.

Birch, J.W. and others. School Achievement and Effect to Type Size on Reading in Visually Handicapped Children. Cooperative Research Project No. 1766, Contract No. OEC-4-10-028. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1966.

Dunn, Lloyd, M. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded - is Much of It Justifiable?" Exceptional Children, V. 35(1). (September, 1968), 5-24.

Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Technique." Psychological Bulletin, (July, 1954).

Flanagan, John C. Measuring Human Performance. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, American Institutes for Research, 1962.

Jones, John Walker. The Visually Handicapped Child at Home and School, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1969.

Jones, John W. and Collins, Anne P. Education Programs for Visually Handicapped Children. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1966, No. 6 Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Peabody, Ralph L. and Birch, Jack W. "Educational Implications of Partial Vision: New Findings from a National Study." The International Journal for the Education of the Blind, XVII (October, 1967) 21-25.

University of Pittsburgh
Division of Specialized Professional Development
Program of Special Education
197

DATA SHEET FOR TEACHERS

A. Please read the following definitions:

Itinerant teacher plan (Jones, 1966)

An organizational pattern whereby blind and/or partially seeing children spend most of their school day in regular classrooms, but receive special instruction individually or in small groups from itinerant teachers who travel among two or more schools devoting more than half of their time to the instruction of children.

Teacher-consultant plan (Jones, 1966)

An organizational plan whereby special teachers serve as itinerant teachers part of the time, but spend 50 percent or more of their time in more general duties, such as consulting with regular school personnel and distributing aids.

Does your plan fit one of these definitions? Please check.

Itinerant teacher plan _____

Teacher-consultant plan _____

If you are spending less than 50 percent of your time as an itinerant teacher, please do not complete the rest of this questionnaire. Please describe your program and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. For item number 1 through 3, please check the one category which most nearly describes your teaching situation.

1) Are you employed as an instructor of visually handicapped children for:

_____academic subjects (100 percent)

_____orientation and mobility (100 percent)

_____both (please indicate amount of time)

academic _____percent

orientation & mobility_____percent

If you provide a service (such as teaching of Optacon, Vocational Education, etc.) to children who are normally assigned to another teacher, please indicate numbers of children and service provided.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Is the agency in which you are employed:

_____public day school

_____residential school

_____private agency (please explain)

_____

_____

_____public agency (please explain)

_____

_____

3. Is the area in which you are teaching considered to be predominantly:

_____rural

_____suburban

_____urban

_____inner-city urban

C. For items number 4 through 7 please check one or more categories as they most nearly describe your teaching situation.

4. Who is responsible for referrals of children for your services:

_____ social workers

_____ school nurse

_____ classroom teachers

_____principals or other administrators

_____ eye specialists

_____parents

_____ other (please explain)

_____

_____

_____

5. Do other services which are available to your children and their parents include:

_____ social work counseling

_____ vocational counseling

_____ remedial reading services

_____ psychological counseling

_____ psychological testing

_____ low-vision aid clinic

_____ other (please explain)

_____

_____

_____

6. If you do not serve preschool children, what agency(ies) in your area do serve preschool children:

_____ private social agencies

_____ state rehabilitation agencies

_____ none

_____ other (please explain)

7. Who arranges for the precurement of materials for the children with whom you work:

_____ itinerant teacher of visually handicapped

_____ instructional material center

_____ school purchasing agent

_____ head teacher or superviser

_____ instructional material specialist

_____ other (please explain)

_____

_____

D. If you are employed as an instructor of academic subjects (100 percent), or Orientation and Mobility (100 percent), please complete each category of response for items 8, 9 & 10.

8. Please indicate the number of visually handicapped students for whom you are responsible.

	Visual Learners*	Non-Visual Learners*
preschool	_____	_____
elementary (grade 1-6) or ungraded age 6-12)	_____	_____
secondary (grade 7-12 or ungraded age 12-)	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-academic	_____	_____

*Visual Learner - one who uses vision as his chief avenue of learning.

*Non-Visual Learner - one who uses another modality than vision (tactual, auditory) as his chief avenue of learning.

9. Of the children listed in item 8, indicate the numbers who are in other special programs (e.g. EMR, TMR, PH, etc.)

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____

10. Of the children listed in item 8, indicate the numbers who require regular service as opposed to these you see very infrequently.

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-academic	_____	_____

E. If you are employed as an instructor of both academic subjects and Orientation and Mobility, Please complete each category of reponse for items 11 through 17.

11. Please indicate the number of children whom you instruct in O&M only, and who are assigned to another teacher for academic instruction.

	Visual Learners*	Non-Visual Learners*
preschool	_____	_____
elementary (grade 1-6 or ungraded age 6-12)	_____	_____
secondary (grade 7-12 or ungraded age 12-)	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-academic)	_____	_____

12. Of the children listed in item 11, indicate the numbers who are in other special programs (e.g. EMR, TMR, PH, etc.)

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____

*Visual Learner - one who uses vision as his chief avenue of learning.

*Non-Visual Learner - one who uses another modality than vision (tactual, auditory) as his chief avenue of learning.

13. Of the children listed in item 11, indicate the numbers who require regular service as opposed to those you see very infrequently.

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-academic	_____	_____

14. Indicate the number of students for whom you are responsible for both academic instruction and instruction in O&M.

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-academic	_____	_____

15. Of the children listed in item 14, indicate the numbers who are in other special programs (e.g. EMR, TMR, PH, etc.)

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____

16. Of the children listed in item 14, indicate the numbers who require regular service as opposed to those you see very infrequently.

	Visual Learners	Non-Visual Learners
preschool	_____	_____
elementary	_____	_____
secondary	_____	_____
severely multihandicapped non-handicapped	_____	_____

17. Please indicate according to the above categories the numbers of children whom you serve who are not included in 13 & 14 (Explain)

_____

_____

_____

F. Please complete the following responses if you have responsibilities for severely multihandicapped non-academic children.

18. Number of children in age groups:

0 - 6 _____

6 - 12 _____

12 - 18 _____

over 18 _____

19. Number of above children place in:

State School and Hospital _____

Homebound _____

Private Agencies _____
(please describe)

_____

_____

Special Classroom _____

Other (please explain) _____

_____

_____

G. If you have responsibilities for children other than the visually handicapped, please describe the children and your functions as a teacher with them.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

H. Please estimate as nearly as possible the percentage of your time (school year) which is involved with each of the following activities.

ACTIVITY	% of Time
Direct contact with parents	_____
Direct instruction of children	_____
Direct contact with regular classroom teachers	_____
Procurement & construction of materials	_____
Consultation with other professional personnel	_____
Direction of volunteers	_____
Consultation with community agencies	_____
Collecting information on referrals.	_____
Administration (reports, meetings, etc.)	_____
Driving	_____
Other (specify below)	_____
_____	
_____	
_____	
_____	

FUNCTIONS OF ITINERANT TEACHERS

Directions: For each category, please indicate the number of children for whom you perform the following functions

FUNCTIONS	Severely Multi-handicapped		Preschool		Elementary		Secondary	
	Visual Learners	Non-visual Leaners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners
1. Collect medical information								
2. Consult with parents								
3. Consult with principal, or other administrative personnel								
4. Consult with nurse								
5. Consult with guidance Counselor								
6. Consult with school psychologist								
7. Consult with classroom teacher								
8. Consult with social worker or case worker								
9. Observe child in school setting								
10. Observe child in home								

FUNCTION	Severely Multi-handicapped		Preschool		Elementary		Secondary	
	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners
11. Interpret medical information and visual functioning of child to regular classroom teacher								
12. Suggest environmental modification (seating arrangement, lighting, etc.) to regular classroom teacher								
13. Assess reading performance								
14. Assess mathematics performance								
15. Assess listening ability								
16. Assess study skills								
17. Assess visual functioning								
18. Assess independence in travel								
19. Assess social skills								
*20. Teach reading								

*For purposes of this investigation, "teach" includes activities supplementary to regular classroom instruction as well as activities initiated by itinerant teacher.

FUNCTION	Severely Multi-handicapped		Preschool		Elementary		Secondary	
	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners
21. Teach reading with the Optacon								
22. Teach social skills;grooming, eating, interaction with peers, etc.								
23. Teach mathematics								
24. Teach activities of daily living								
25. Teach listening								
26. Teach typing								
27. Teach Utilization of Low Vision								
28. Teach orientation and independent travel								
29. Teach motor skills								
30. Teach study skills (use of library, readers, recordings, etc.)								
31. Teach use of tangible aids								
32. Teach foreign language								
33. Teach prevocational skills								

FUNCTION	Severely Multi-handicapped		Preschool		Elementary		Secondary	
	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners
34. Teach use of abacus								
35. Teach social studies								
36. Teach sciences								
37. Teach reading of music								
38. Locate and procure materials								
39. Provide models and real objects for regular classroom teachers to use for experiences with VH child								
40. Teach child about vocational opportunities								
41. Prepare materials for classroom use								
42. Prepare education plan for regular and/or special classroom teacher for VH child								
43. Administer and score standard achievement test								
44. Consult with and train volunteers								
45. Consult with vocational counselors								

FUNCTION	Severely Multi-handicapped		Preschool		Elementary		Secondary	
	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners	Visual Learners	Non-visual Learners
46. Arrange for readers								
47. Teach child to independently acquire specialized materials								
48. Prepare child and new school for entrance of handicapped child								
49. Provide guidance toward personal and social adjustment								
50. Other (explain) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____								

Please indicate which of the following functions you perform in addition to your responsibilities for children on your caseload.

_____ 1. Review referral materials

_____ 2. Participate in school vision screening

_____ 3. Participate in recommendations of placement of children in other programs

_____ 4. Conduct formal and/or informal in-service training for regular classroom teachers, nurses, and other school personnel

_____ 5. Participate in medical-psychological-instructor teams

_____ 6. Periodically review children not requiring regular service

_____ 7. Give homebound instruction

_____ 8. Arrange opportunities for extra-curricular activities and after school activities

_____ 9. Make referrals to appropriate persons for auxiliary services needed for children

_____ 10. Review placement of children in other programs (residential school, special classroom, etc.)

_____ 11. Make speeches, give demonstrations, etc. for community organizations such as Lions Clubs, Kiwanis, etc.

Please add any additional functions you perform indicating the type of child for whom you perform the function according to the previous categories.